

# EXPLORING MULTIFRAME LEADERSHIP IN PROMOTING EFFECTIVE SCHOOL LEADERSHIP IN INDONESIA

Suyantiningasih, M.Ed.

## Abstract

Effective school leadership is one of significant key to implementing reform policies. In addition, effective leadership in schools depends largely on the ability of the leaders to develop and engage in complex thinking, and the ability to use multiple frames of reference to analyze and solve problems. This paper aims to consider a new approach which is multiframe leadership to address the issue of school leadership in Indonesia. This study used the "multiframe" (structural, human resource, political, and symbolic) organizational theory of Bolman and Deal (2003) to examine aspects of leadership, organizational and management. This paper details definitions and concepts of multiframe leadership, possibilities to implementation, and the implications of this new leadership reform toward the school leader, teachers, and educational policies in Indonesia. The review of literature led this paper to four main findings. First, the structural frame emphasized goals, specialized roles and formal relationships. Problems and performance gaps arise from structural deficiencies and can be improved through restructuring. Second, the challenge for human resource frame is to tailor organizations to the people, and particularly to find ways for these individuals to "buy in" to what they are charged to do. Third, from the political perspective, different interests compete for power and scarce resources and conditions emerge around special interests and also change as issues in the organization change. It is not practical to view each member as a person only interested in doing their work or playing their structured role. Every member is a part of a vast coalition made of various and conflicting interests. To manage in this environment, a leader must identify the alliances and agendas of every constituent, and they must protect their own positions as leaders by maintaining a sizeable alliance on their side. And, fourth, the symbolic frame sees an organization as cultures motivated by rituals, ceremonies, heroes and myths rather than by rules, policies and managerial authority. This study demonstrates how the multiframe thinking can be used to provide a meaningful guidance and valuable insight for school leaders to analyze, manage and lead the school effectively. In conclusion, by viewing an organization through the structural, human resources, political and symbolic frames, school leaders are better able to avoid and solve unforeseen problems.

**Keywords:** Muliframe Leadership, School Principals, School Leadership

## A. Introduction

School environments and situations have become more complex and varied during the past two decades. The rapid changes in society demand that students acquire the knowledge and skills that will help them achieve success in school and in life. On the other hand, the evolving nature of school environments leads to new demands on educational leaders, particularly in promoting good teaching and high level learning

(Blue Ribbon Panel on School Leadership, 2003). The rapid social policy changes in Indonesia are influencing the characteristics of school leaders and the form that school leadership needs to take. School leaders have a huge responsibility for providing effective professional leadership related to the teaching and learning process while at the same time, providing effective organizational leadership, which involves the management of employees, financial resources and external relationships (Umaedi, 2001).

After years of a dictatorial style of leadership and now with the emergence of the new policy which demands decentralization, management staff in educational institutions feel that the new, internally appointed school leaders are an improvement. Tuhsetya (2007) argued that the feudalistic style of school leadership in Indonesia has become the major issue of school reform. He claimed that school leaders still resist innovations, since maintaining the status quo and their status and power are effective tools to keep them in the cycle of authority. The current style of school leadership in Indonesia makes the leadership and educational practices only a cosmetic exercise. Most decisions are made by senior management prior to debate and are considered irrevocable, which creates a sense of despair and apathy throughout schools. Moreover, because the feudalistic style of school leadership continues to exist in Indonesia, there is no specific, transparent and concrete pattern of leadership style which is suitable for the Indonesia context. As Yukl (2006) has found, one leadership style does not fit every situation. Hence, it is important for an individual, who strives to be an effective leader, to take into account multiple variables such as his or her organizational climate, resources, personal traits and values and the characteristics of the people they will lead. In addition, leaders of professional educators or principals may find it best to lead by combining some of the leadership styles, especially since this profession maintains a code of ethics that encompasses a wide range of ethical decision-making guidelines.

This study investigates multiframe leadership for enhancing school leadership in Indonesia. The intent of the study is to produce a formulation about the leadership orientation frames in order to add to and enrich the existing literature on school

leaders, as well as the existing body of knowledge on leadership. In addition, this study intends to serve as a valuable investigation of the leadership frame perceptions among the various school leaders. The expectation is that future school leaders might use this study as a resource to assess their own individual leadership styles and frames. This study aims to explore multiframe leadership and consider it as a new approach to address the issues of school leadership that could be implemented in the Indonesian context. This study primarily aims to explore a better style of school leadership in Indonesia, which emphasizes that learning, teaching and leading are interwoven so that to understand learning is to understand the essence of teaching and, by teaching, educationalists understand the essence of leading. By analyzing and synthesizing the findings from previous studies, it is expected that this study will provide a framework for analyzing practice that enables school leaders to lead and manage schools and contribute to excellence and effective school leadership and improved student learning outcomes.

## **B. Defining Leadership**

Leadership, in all contexts, has always been an interesting phenomenon for educational researchers to explore, investigate and attempt to define. According to Leithwood and Reihl (2003), in the field of education, as in many other institutional contexts, leadership has taken on increased importance in recent years. On the other hand, Maxcy (1991 cited in Sergiovanni, 2003), argued that a definition of leadership can rest on several foundations: theoretical and philosophical treatises from traditions of hermeneutics; critical theory; deconstructionism; and pragmatic philosophy. In addition, Ogawa and Bossert (1995) claimed that

Leadership flows through the networks of roles that comprise organizations. The medium of leadership and the currency of leadership lie in the personal resources of people. And leadership shapes the systems that produce patterns of interaction and the meanings that other participants attach to organizational events” (p. 225).

According to Kotter (1988), the word “leadership” is commonly used in two basic ways in everyday conversation. The first is to refer to the process of moving a group or

groups of people in some direction through (mostly) non coercive means. Secondly is to refer to people who are in roles where leadership is expected. He also asserted that good leadership moves people or followers in a direction that is genuinely in their real long term best interests.

Definitions of leadership vary in each perspective and context. It could depend on the leadership attributes, such as beliefs, values, ethics, character, knowledge and skills, or the context held by users. In addition, Palmer (2007) noted that the definitions of leadership have a wide range and common characteristics such as the ability to inspire, influence, achieve goals, stimulate and respond to a shared direction. Bennis (1989) argued that leadership is focused much more on the individual capability of the leader. It involves the capability of knowing the organization and its members, formulating a vision that is well communicated, building trust among colleagues, and taking effective action to reach the goal.

On the other hand, Schermerhor (2002 cited in Ribiere & Sitar, 2003) articulated leadership as the process of inspiring others to work hard to accomplish important tasks. According to Palmer (2007), leadership “involves having a vision of the future direction of the organization and activating employees to work towards achieving it, eliciting cooperation and teamwork, motivating and keeping followers motivated, and producing change” (p. 14). Furthermore, Daft (2005) asserted that leadership is a process that involves influencing people to “bring about change towards a desirable future” (p. 5).

A more comprehensive definition of leadership is established by Bolman and Deal (2003), who stated that leadership is a “subtle process of mutual influence combining thought, feeling, and action to produce cooperative effort in the service of purposes and values embraced by both leader and the led” (p. 24). Furthermore, Daft (2005 cited in Palmer, 2007) argued that leadership is about “creating a compelling vision of the future and developing farsighted strategies for producing the changes needed to achieve that vision” (p. 15). Kotter (1996) also articulated leadership as a means of establishing direction by “developing a vision of the future, and the strategies to

create it”; aligning people by “communicating direction in words and deeds to everyone whose cooperation is needed to create the vision”; and motivating and inspiring by “energizing people to overcome major political, bureaucratic, and resource barriers to change by satisfying basic, but often unfulfilled, human needs” (p. 26).

Drawing from the literature above, it can be conceptualized that leadership is a process by which a person influences others to accomplish an objective and direct the organization in a way that makes it more cohesive and coherent. Leadership involves fundamental elements such as inspiring and influencing people and followers, achieving goals, working out a path with vision and implementing change. Generally speaking, leadership is also distinct from authority. Weber (1947 cited in Bolman and Deal, 2003) linked authority to legitimacy. He affirmed that authority and leadership are both built on voluntary obedience. “If leaders lose legitimacy, they lose the capacity to lead” (p. 337). In this sense, Heifetz (1994) argued that authority can be an impediment to leadership.

On the other hand, leadership is also different from management. As DuBrin (2004) argued, to be able to understand leadership, we must acknowledge the distinction between leadership and management. Bennis and Nanus (1985) also offered the distinction by stating that “managers do things right, and leaders do the right thing” (p. 21). Moreover, Daft (2005) recorded that leaders and managers both pay much more attention to providing direction for the organization, though in different ways. However, Kotter (1996) viewed management as primarily about planning, organizing, and controlling. He also argued that leadership is about a change-oriented process of visioning, networking and building relationships. Conversely, Gardner (1989) proposed some dimensions to differentiate between leadership and management. He stated that leaders think long term, look comprehensively towards the organization; and “influence constituents beyond their immediate formal jurisdiction” (Gardner, 1989, p. 23). Similarly, Daft (2005) confirmed that management is concerned with short term results, while leadership focuses more on the long-term future of the organization.

In summary, it can be seen that leadership is fundamentally situated in both context and relationship. As Gardner (1989) asserted, leaders are not independent actors, since they both shape and are shaped by their constituents. Likewise, according to Murphy (1985), leadership is not simply about what a leader does but what occurs in a relationship.

### **C. The Overview of Multiframe Leadership Theory**

This study focused on the Bolman and Deal (2003) leadership theories in which they condensed and defined existing organizational theories into a four-frame perspective consisting of a structural frame, human resource frame, political frame and symbolic frame. Bolman and Deal (2003) observed that leaders basically view organizational experiences based on leadership styles or frames. Thus, Bolman and Deal (2003) developed several aspects of these theories and produced their leadership frame theory in which they identified four specific leadership style categories. These leadership frames are detailed below.

#### **1. The Structural Frame**

According to Bolman and Deal (2003), the assumptions of structural frame reflect a belief in rationality and a faith that the right formal arrangements minimize problems and maximize performance. In addition, they formulated six assumption underlying the structural frame which are:

- (1) Organizations exist to achieve established goals and objectives;
- (2) Organizations increase efficiency and enhance performance through specialization and a clear division of labor;
- (3) Appropriate forms of coordination and control ensure that diverse efforts of individuals and units mesh;
- (4) Organizations work best when rationality prevails over personal preferences and extraneous pressures;
- (5) Structures must be designed to fit an organization's circumstances, including goals, technology, workforce and environment;
- and (6) Problems and performance gaps arise from structural deficiencies and can be remedied through analysis and restructuring (p. 45).

In general, structural leaders define and set clear goals and directions, assign specific roles for their constituents and coordinate specific activities with specific policies, procedures and chains of command. They emphasize rationality, efficiency, structure, and policies. As a result, the structural leader tries to align the internal processes of the organization to the external environment, while dealing with organizational dilemmas. Furthermore, structural leaders value analysis and data, keep their eye on the bottom line and hold people accountable for results (Bolman & Deal, 1991; 2003).

## **2. The Human Resource Frame.**

In any context and situation, organizations can be alienating and frustrating. Globalization and the growth in size and power of modern institutions require a sensitive understanding of people and their symbiotic relationship with organizations (Barstow & Bergman, 2003 cited in Bolman & Deal, 2003). The human resource frame is built on core assumptions that organizations exist to serve human needs rather than the reverse, and, the relationship of people and organizations must be built in a mutual way (Bolman & Deal, 2003).

In summary, the human resource frame focuses on the needs and interactions of people or between the individual and organizational needs. Human resource leaders or leaders who work within the human resource frame, value the feelings and relationships of people, assume the organization must meet basic human needs, and seek to lead through facilitation and empowerment (Bolman & Deal, 2003).

One task of leadership in the human resource frame, according to Katzenbach and Smith (1993), is to help groups develop a “shared sense of direction and commitment” (p.17). Furthermore, they found that a key characteristic of high performance teams was mutual accountability, fostered when leaders shared in the work and all the team members shared in leadership. Bolman and Deal (2003) also strongly argued that leadership, whether shared or individual, plays a critical role in group effectiveness and individual satisfaction. They contended that effective leaders help members communicate and work together as a solid team. Less effective leaders, it is argued, always try to dominate and get their own ideas accepted.

### **3. The Political Frame.**

The political frame perceives organizations as living political arenas that “host a complex web of individual and group interests” (Bolman & Deal, 2003, p. 186). They had five propositions underpinning the political frame. First, organizations are a coalition of complex and diverse both individual and group interests. Second, the differences among coalition members in “values, beliefs, information, interests, and perceptions of reality” keep persisting; which thus leads to the third proposition which is “conflict central of organizational dynamic and underline power as the most important asset” (p. 186). Fourth, important decisions involve “scarce resources” (p. 186). Fifth, most goals and decisions are derived from bargaining and negotiation.

The political frame basically emphasizes conflict among individual and group interests for scarce resources. It also involves generating consensus for making deals. Political leaders are seen as advocates and negotiators to create networking, coalitions between different interest groups for use of limited resources, build power bases and negotiate compromises. In addition, Bolman and Deal (2003) affirmed that in this political frame, organizational members compete for power and might use conflict as a positive source for change.

### **4. The Symbolic Frame.**

The symbolic leader frame is based on the core assumption that symbols “embody and express an organization’s culture: the interwoven pattern of beliefs, values, practices, and artifacts that defines for members who they are and how they are to do things” (Bolman & Deal, 2003, p. 243).

The symbolic leader develops symbols and culture in order to shape human behavior and reflects a shared mission as well as identity for the organization. In this sense, meaning and predictability are socially constructed and facts are more interpretative rather than objective. Symbolic leaders working in the symbolic frame inspire enthusiasm, a sense of charisma and drama to the organization. Furthermore, they



are attentive towards myth, ritual, ceremony, stories and other symbolic forms of leadership (Bolman & Deal, 1991; 2003).

Based on the four frames that have been discussed above, it can be assumed that leadership frames can be used to evaluate managerial and leadership effectiveness. The research conducted by Bolman and Deal (1991) stressed that leaders apply a multiframe approach which is significant for making decisions and taking effective actions.

Similar to Bolman and Deal's leadership model, some other studies have found multiframe leadership is related to effective direction of programs. The research by Bolman and Deal (1991) on the multiframe approach is supported by research studies by Howard (2005). Similarly, Howard groups leadership styles into four types: Type A, B, C, and D. He stated that Type A (fact based) leaders were appropriate when setting demand theories, analysis and technical processes. These leaders perform best with emphasis on the bottom line.

On the other hand, Type B leaders (creativity based) build an environment that endorses creativity and spontaneity. These leaders consider problem solving with an artistic, flexible and imaginative approach. Leaders categorized in Type C (feelings based) construct decisions based upon intuitiveness, emotions and interpersonal relationships rather than facts. Type D (control/power based) leaders apply control over people and tasks, as well as environments. As a result, these leaders are inflexible, prefer to use control in responding to people, and are advocates for tradition (Howard, 2005).

The analyses of leadership styles derived both from Bolman and Deal and Howard are similar. Type A closely aligns with the structural frame, Type B parallels the symbolic frame, Type C with the human resource frame, and Type D with the political frame (Bolman and Deal, 1991; 2003; Howard, 2005). Furthermore, according to Sullivan (2001 cited in Blankenbaker, 2006), who studied four distinct generations of community college leaders, the Bolman and Deal leadership model has been studied extensively and most recently in college leadership.

Another study using the multiframe approach is also supported by research studies by Bensimon (1990). He studied college presidents and found that multiframe presidents were viewed as more effective than presidents wedded to a single frame. Furthermore, single-frame presidents tended to be less experienced, relying mainly on the structural frame or human resource perspective. Presidents who relied solely on the structural frame were likely to be considered as ineffective leaders. Similarly, Heimovics, Herman and Jurkiewicz (1995) found the same result for chief executives in non profit organizations. Likewise, Doctor (1993) found the same result for directors of family service organizations in Kentucky. The study conducted by Harlow and Lawler (2000) also indicated that leaders rarely use more than two frames collectively and rarely use all four frames collectively.

Bolman and Grenell (1999) provided further supporting evidence on the effectiveness of multiframe leadership by conducting a study of populations of managers and administrators in both business and education. The results showed that the ability to apply multiframe leadership was a consistent correlate of effectiveness. The results indicated that effectiveness as a manager was associated with structural frame, whereas the symbolic and political frames were much more likely to be the major determinants of effectiveness of a leader. On the other hand, Wimpelberg (1987) studied eighteen school principals. He found that principals of ineffective schools relied highly on the structural frame, whereas principals in effective schools used multiframe leadership.

Based on the multitude of research above which supports evidence of an effective implementation of multiframe leadership, the study of multiframe leadership to promote effective school leadership in Indonesia is significant. Hence, to gain a more comprehensive understanding about multiframe leadership, the next section will discuss some key factors which underpin effective school leadership.

#### **D. Key Factors that Contribute to Effective School Leadership**

Deal and Peterson (1990) claimed that educational leaders basically serve multiple constituencies; they are expected to develop and implement practices to ensure the

achievement of multiple purposes. On the other hand, Bess and Goldman (2001) described educational leaders as being caught in a zone of ambiguity. They observed that educational leaders are uncertain about the transition they are in, and they are unclear about what behaviors are appropriate in the transition stage or the next stage.

Hence, without leadership, Bolman and Deal (1991) argued, most people would agree that attempts at school reform are doomed. Furthermore, Hopkins (2001) contended that researchers and many other scholars from the international field of school effectiveness and school improvement have consistently highlighted the importance of leadership in generating better schools.

The work of Bolman and Deal (1991, 2003) and Quinn (1988) had a direct relationship to the comprehensive approach where all measurable leadership variables (traits or personality variables, task orientations and structure, leader-follower relationships and situational contexts) could be used to examine a leader's effectiveness. They acknowledged the multitude of measurable variables in leadership effectiveness and prescribed a multiframe approach for understanding the personal attributes, leadership style and situational contexts of leadership behavior.

In summary, there is a wide range of evidence to suggest that the quality of leadership positively enhances teaching and learning. Moreover, leadership has been shown to make a difference to the school's ability to improve by influencing the motivation of teachers and the quality of teaching (Fullan, 2001; Sergiovanni, 2003). As Leithwood and Riel (2003, p. 3) articulated, "large scale studies of schooling conclude that the effects of leadership on student learning are small but educationally significant.". Research has shown that key factors which contribute to effective school leadership can be described in the following areas as outlined below.

### **1. School Quality and Accountability**

Cheng (1996b) affirmed that the changing environment of schools has brought a shift in emphasis from school maintenance to school quality and accountability. According

to Cheng (2002), the reason for these changes is to satisfy the needs of diverse stakeholders for high quality education in a changing environment. Hence, it is insufficient to only maintain smooth functioning.

Another paradigm shift occurred in the education sectors. Mukhopadhyay (2001) articulated that concepts applied in business and industry such as quality control, quality assurance, total quality management and benchmarking, have been brought into the education sector. Different parameters are being used in assessing and setting education standards and quality or benchmarking for school performance and accountability (Gibbon, 1996). Furthermore, Cheng (1996b) asserted that in developing countries (Asian countries, such as Mainland China and Thailand), some critical issues have emerged out of efforts to monitor and assess education quality.

The critical issues faced by most Asian countries include how to balance between a school's internal development and accountability in public; how to handle the potential conflicts in purposes and practices between school self-evaluation and development and external development; how to choose an appropriate combination of "indicators of input, performance, and outcomes"; how to set quality standards and benchmarks; and how to manage monitoring between the "school-site and the system level" (Cheng, 1996b, p. 106).

The critical issues also have some implications for school leaders. Given the critical importance of leadership in pursuing education quality, Goetsch and Davis (1994) argued that school leadership becomes a key concern in quality assurance and quality inspection. George (1992 cited in Cheng, 2002) also indicated that these issues inevitably become challenges to school leaders as they seek to ensure education quality and accountability to the public. In fact, Cheng (2002) observed that the new emphasis on public accountability demands that school leaders establish good public relations, "market the school's strengths and image, and build up the school's reputation in the community" (p.107).

In addition, three broad categories of successful school leadership practices have been identified as important for leadership success in almost all settings and

organizations based on the work of Leithwood and Riehl in 2003. Leithwood and Riehl's category labels of practice are setting directions, redesigning organizations and developing people, as described below.

## **2. Setting Directions**

Hallinger and Heck (2002 cited in Leithwood and Riehl 2003, p. 17) stated that the fundamental aspect of the work of leadership is assisting a group of organizational members to “develop shared understanding about the organization and its activities and goals that can undergird a sense of purpose or vision.” They proposed three sets of leadership practices that are cited as helping set direction: (1) identifying and articulating a vision, where Leithwood and Riehl, (2003) argued that educational leaders have opportunities to help set direction by identifying, developing and articulating a vision that can inspire followers; (2) fostering the acceptance of group goals by “encouraging cooperation among staff and assisting them to work together toward common goals” (p. 17); and (3) creating high performance expectations by providing direction through actions, “such as verbal persuasion, that demonstrate their expectations for excellence, quality, and high performance on the part of staff” (p. 18).

## **3. Developing People**

McColl-Kennedy and Anderson (2002 cited in Leithwood and Riehl, 2003 p. 19) stated that recent evidence suggests that leaders' emotional intelligence displayed through the personal attention “devoted by a leader to an employee, and the use of the employee's capacities increases the level of enthusiasm and optimism, reduces frustration, transmits a sense of mission and indirectly increases performance.” Developing people basically emphasizes a principal's role in influencing the motivation and capacities of their members (Leithwood & Riehl, 2003). According to Leithwood and Riehl (2003), there are three sets of leadership practices in term of developing people. Firstly, offering intellectual simulation by generating the questions and ideas that encourage change by challenging staff to “reexamine assumptions about their work and rethink how it can be performed”(p.20). Secondly, providing individualized

support by “showing respect and concern about their personal feelings and needs”(p. 20). Third, providing an appropriate model by “setting examples for staff to follow that are consistent with the organization’s value” (p. 20).

#### **4. Redesigning the Organization**

Leithwood and Riehl (2003) stated that successful educational leaders develop their schools as effective organizations that support and sustain the performance of both teachers and students. They acknowledged that the “objective behind organizational cultures and structures should match the changing nature of the school’s improvement agenda” (p. 20). Three more specific practices in redesigning the organization, according Leithwood and Riehl (2003) are described as follows. First, strengthen school cultures by influencing organizational culture through practices aimed at developing shared norms, values, beliefs and attitudes among staff, and promoting mutual caring and building trust among staff. Second, modify organizational structures by “redesigning organizational structures through changes, including task assignments, the organization of time and space, routine operating procedures, and the deployment of material resources” (p. 20). Third, build collaborative processes by enhancing the performance of the school and providing staff with the opportunities to take a part in decision making.

Indonesia has been practicing a leadership style that basically could be categorized as traditional. According to Cheng (2002), traditional leadership theories emphasize the duality of leadership in terms of concern for people and tasks. Hence, this type of leadership tends to ignore the cultural and political aspects of the organizational process in schools. Furthermore, these theoretical frames are insufficient to support the practices of leadership in a rapidly changing local and global environment.

Bolman and Deal (2003) have proposed four leadership frames in organizations, which are structural, human resource, political and symbolic. Kwok, Lo and Cheng (1997) stated that empirical findings based on these four frames of leadership provide strong evidence in describing multiple aspect of school leadership. In addition, the structural, human resource, political and symbolic dimensions of principal leadership

were found to be strongly related to the school's perceived organizational effectiveness, principal-teacher relationships, strength of organizational culture, the authority hierarchy and teacher participation in decision making (Cheng, 2002).

Ultimately, the reconceptualization of school leadership provides very substantial possibilities for rethinking and reframing the aims, scope, process, practices and influence of school leadership in the rapid changing arena of school development and reform.

## **F. Summary**

Multiframe leadership is basically a powerful tool that permits leaders to see and understand more about the organization as a whole. The multi perspective of this leadership style provides the ability to see new possibilities, challenges and also to create new opportunities that enable leaders to discover some alternatives to effectively solve the problems faced by the organization. This style of leadership consists of four frames of leadership: structural frame, human resources frame, political frame and symbolic frame. The structural frame of leadership views the job of managers and leaders to focus on tasks, facts, and logic, not personality and emotions. Most "people" problems really stem from structural flaws rather than from flaws in individuals. Structural managers and leaders are not necessarily authoritarian and do not necessarily solve every problem by issuing orders (though that will sometimes be appropriate). Instead, they try to design and implement a process or structure appropriate to the problem and the circumstances.

In addition, the fundamental responsibility of managers and leaders is to clarify organizational goals, to attend to the relationship between structure and environment, and to develop a structure that is clear and appropriate to the goals, the task and the environment. Without such a structure, people become unsure about what they are supposed to be doing. The result is confusion, frustration and conflict. In an effective organization, individuals are clear about their responsibilities and their contribution. Policies, linkages and lines of authority are well-defined. When an

organization has the right structure and people understand it, the organization can achieve its goals and individuals can be effective in their roles.

The second element of multiple leadership, the human resources frame, contends that people are the heart of any organization. When people feel the organization is responsive to their needs and supportive of their goals, managers and leaders can count on their followers' commitment and loyalty. Managers and leaders who are authoritarian or insensitive, who don't communicate effectively, or who simply don't care about their people can never be effective managers and leaders. The human resource manager and leader work on behalf of both the organization and its people, seeking to serve the best interests of both.

Furthermore, human resource managers and leaders empower their followers through participation and openness, as well as by making sure that they have the autonomy and the resources they need to do their jobs well. Human resource managers and leaders acknowledge honest, two-way communication as a way to identify issues and resolve differences. They are willing to confront others when it is appropriate, but they try to do so in a spirit of openness and caring.

The political frame basically demands school leaders encourage an open climate to deal with diversity in interests and the mutual conflicts among organizations, both externally and internally. Leaders have a responsibility to build up alliances among organizations to implement school plans and agendas and also promote wide participation in decision making. Furthermore, school leaders should emphasize the significance of democratic values in decision making and facilitate members to be able to understand the meaning of collaboration and coalition in school management and leadership.

The final element of multiframe leadership, the symbolic frame, allows school leaders to use their own charisma in order to help members experiencing cultural changes from the changing environment. In addition, this frame will assist leaders to pursue a culture of excellence.



To sum up, conceptually, school leadership should integrate the four frames or dimensions into the operation of the organizations to maximize the effectiveness and the efficiency in pursuing the organizations' objectives and goals in a coherent way. The critical issues faced by most Asian countries, including Indonesia, include how to balance the school's internal development and accountability in public; how to handle the potential conflicts in purposes and practices between school self-evaluation and development, and external development; how to choose an appropriate combination of indicators of input, performance, and outcomes; how to set quality standards and benchmarks; and how to manage monitoring between the school-site and the system level. Therefore, solving those kinds of problems by balancing a school's internal development and promoting school quality and public accountability; handling the potential conflicts; reconceptualizing and restructuring the organization and leadership style; setting the quality standards and benchmarks to support the accountability and public transparency; and also managing the control system of organizations internally and externally, are significant steps to be achieved by school leaders.

## References

- Bennis, W. (1989). *Leaders*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Bennis, W.G. & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: Strategies for taking charge*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Bensimon, E. M. (1990). The meaning of "Good Presidential Leadership:" A frame analysis. *The Review of Higher Education*, 12 (2), 107-123.

- Bess, J. & Goldman, P. (2001). Leadership ambiguity in universities and K-12 schools: the limits of contemporary leadership theory. *Leadership Quarterly*, 12, 419-50.
- Blankenbaker, Z.A. (2006). *The leadership path of R. Jan LeCroy*. Denton, Texas: University of North Texas.
- Blue Ribbon Panel on School Leadership. (2003). *Growing Tomorrow's Leaders Today*. New York: New York State Education Department.
- Bolman, L.G. & Deal, T.E. (2003). *Reframing organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bolman, L.G. & Deal, T.E. (1991). Leadership and management effectiveness: A multi-frame, multi-sector analysis. *Human Resource Management*, 30, 509-534.
- Bolman, L.G. & Granell, E. (1999). *Versatile leadership: A comparative analysis of reframing in Venezuelan managers*. Madrid: American Academy of Management.
- Cheng, Y.C. (1996b). *School effectiveness and school-based management: A mechanism for development*. London: Falmer Press.
- Cheng, Y.C. (2002). *Multi-models of education quality and principal leadership*. London: Kluwer Academic Publisher.
- Daft, R.L. (2005). *The leadership experience* (3<sup>rd</sup> edn). Mason, Ohio: Thompson South-Western.
- Deal, T.E. & Peterson, K.D. (1990). *The principal's role in shaping school culture*. Washington, D.C.: Educational Research and Improvement.
- Doctor, J. (1993). *The early implementation of the family resource and youth services centers of Kentucky: Multiframe perspective*. Kentucky: Vanderbilt University.
- DuBrin, A.J. (2004). *Leadership: Research findings, practice, and skills* (4<sup>th</sup>ed). New York: Houghton Mifflin.

- Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a Culture of Change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass/Wiley.
- Gardner, J.W. (1989). *On leadership*. New York: The Free Press.
- Gibbon, F.C. (1996). *Monitoring education: Indicators, quality, and effectiveness*. London: Cassell.
- Goetsch, D. & Davis, S. (1994). *Introduction to total quality: Quality, productivity and competitiveness*. London: Prentice-Hall International.
- Harlow, E. & Lawler, J. (2000). *Social work, management and change*. London: Ashgate.
- Heifetz, R.A. (1994). *Leadership without easy answer*. Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press.
- Heimovics, R.D, Herman, R.D. & Jurkiewicz, C. (1995). The political dimension of effective nonprofit executive leadership. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 5, 223-248.
- Howard, G. (2005). *Leading minds: An anatomy of leadership*. New York: Basic Books.
- Katzenbach, J.R. & Smith, D.K. (1993). *The wisdom of teams: Creating the high-performance organization*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Kotter, J.P. (1988). *The leadership factor*. New York: The Free Press.
- Kwok, M.L., Lo, S.K. & Cheng, Y.C. (1997). New and experienced secondary school principals: Leadership, management difficulties, confidence, efficacy, and satisfaction. *Educational Research Journal*, 12(1), 60-72.
- Leithwood, K. & Reil, C. (2003). *What We Know about Successful School Leadership*. Brief prepared for the Task Force on Developing Research in Educational Leadership by Division A, American Educational Research Association, Temple University.
- Mukhopadhyay, M. (2001). *Total quality management in education*. New Delhi: Educational Planning and Administration.

- Ogawa, T.R. & Bossert, S.T. (1995). Leadership as an organizational quality. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 31(2), 224-24.
- Palmer, C. (2007). *Study Guide: Leaders and leadership*. Flinders University, Adelaide: School of Education.
- Sergiovanni, T. (2003). *Leadership: What's in it for Schools?* London: Routledge Falmer.
- Tuhusetya, S. (2007). Reformasi Sekolah, Kepemimpinan Feodalistis, dan KTSP. Retrieved 24 April 2008, from <http://sawali.info/2007/08/20/reformasi-sekolah-kepemimpinan-feodalistis-dan-ktsp/>
- Wimpelberg, R.K. (1987). Managerial images and school effectiveness. *Administrator's Notebook*, 32, 1-4.
- Yulk, G. (2006). *Leadership in organizations* (3rd ed.). NJ: Prentice Hall.